

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed on May 14, 2008 has been reviewed. Claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Application, (E.P. Application No. 0 981 088 A1) to Paul Damian Tidwell. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:

- a. receiving a message formatted according to Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1); and
- b. decoding the received message based on a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.

Applicants assert that nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests all the claimed limitations of claim 1. In particular, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “decoding the received message based on a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), *wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.*” In addressing this limitation, the Examiner asserted that “a file and a ‘data file’ are equivalent.” Final Office Action (FOA) p. 10. However, while “data files” are one type of file, not all files are “data files” as described and claimed.

The present applications clearly distinguishes between “data files” and other types of files containing routines or executable code. In particular, the present application states, with respect to prior approaches, “For this traditional approach, ASN.1 defined messages are fed through an ASN.1 compiler to obtain compilable or linkable entities

(e.g., *C source file* structures and modules, *object files*, etc.).” Para. [0004] (emphasis added). With respect to embodiments of the present invention, the present application discusses the use of a Configuration Information File (CIF) which is “tree-based and table driven to define message syntax.” Para. [0030]. Thus, the embodiment of claim 1 uses only data stored in a tree-based and table-driven file to define “what actions are to be taken or can be taken with the message” as opposed to prior approaches which use files containing executable routines or source code to achieve similar results. Therefore, the present specification clearly distinguishes a table-driven “data file” from other files containing executable code or routines.

In addition, the Examiner asserted that “The phrase ‘table-driven’ is a phrase that taken in its broadest reasonable interpretation is well met by the Tidwell reference.” FOA p. 11. However, the Examiner has not explained precisely what the interpretation being applied to the phrase “table-driven” is, nor what portion of Tidwell teaches or suggests that interpretation. The Examiner simply stated that “The CIF also defines what actions are to be taken or can be taken with a reference” and referred to paragraphs [0025] and [0034] of Tidwell as support of the assertion that Tidwell teaches “that a message is decoded based on the ASN.1 specification and a set of rules.” FOA p. 10 The Examiner then asserted that “the aforementioned paragraphs of Tidwell exactly teach this concept since both the ASN.1 specification and the set of rules used as referenced in Tidwell are functional in the decoding of the message.” FOA pp. 11.

However, although Tidwell and the present application both discuss achieving similar results of decoding/encoding ASN.1 messages, such achievement of similar results does not indicate that Tidwell uses the same techniques as described and claimed in the present application. For example, the present specification states, in the background section, “in order to be communicated via a data communications service ..., the messages are encoded and then decoded on the receiving side using encoding/decoding rules.” For the prior approaches, “ASN.1 defined messages are fed through an ASN.1 compiler to obtain compilable or linkable entities (e.g., C source file structures and modules, object files, etc.). The entities are compiled and linked with the

other operational software components to obtain resultant software executable, which includes the ability to decode and encode messages that were defined in the original ASN.1 message schema.” Para. [0003]-[0004]. Thus, while the prior approaches discussed in the present application decoded/encoded ASN.1 messages, such approaches did not use a table-driven CIF file, as described and claimed.

Similar to the above prior approaches, Tidwell merely discusses encoding/decoding ASN.1 messages using an ADEP which “can be produced by an ASN.1 compiler which converts an ASN.1 specification, such as that in Table 2, into encoding and decoding *routines in the programming language of the application program* 305. Where a high-level programming language (for example, C, C++, FORTRAN) is used to write the application program, the output of the compiler is *source code* which is again compiled with the application program 305.” Pg. 7 paragraph [0035] (emphasis added). Thus, as with the above prior approaches, Tidwell encodes/decodes ASN.1 messages through “compilable or linkable entities” such as “source code”, but does not teach or suggest encoding/decoding such ASN.1 messages by using a CIF which is a “table-driven data file” as described and claimed.

Furthermore, the proper standard to be applied in interpreting claim language is to give “claims their broadest reasonable construction ‘*in light of the specification*’ as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art.” MPEP § 2111. As discussed above, the present specification clearly distinguishes between a “table-driven” configuration information file and “compilable entities” such as source files. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably interpret the “encoding and decoding routines in the programming language of the application program” or the compiler source code output, as discussed in Tidwell, to be a “table-driven” CIF as described and claimed in the present application.

For the reasons stated above, the Applicants assert that Tidwell fails to teach or suggest “decoding the received message based on a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), *wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.*” Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 10, 19, 30 and 35 each contain limitations similar to the limitation discussed above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claims 10 and 19 contain the limitation “a configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” Claims 30 and 35 contain the limitation “a previously stored configuration information file (CIF), the CIF being a table-driven data file.” Accordingly, the arguments discussed above with respect to claim 1 are applicable to claims 10, 19, 30, and 35 and not repeated for the sake of brevity. For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, claims 10, 19, 30, and 35 are not anticipated by Tidwell. Applicants, therefore, request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, and 8 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Similarly, claims 11-15, 17, 20-25, 27, 31, 33, 36, and 38 depend from claims 10, 19, 30, and 35 respectively and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above concerning the respective independent claims. Applicants, therefore, request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 18, 28, 34, and 39 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell (E.P. Application No. 0 981 088 A1) in view of applicant's admitted prior art (Judd et al, U.S. Application No. 2005/0181787, Paragraph [0021]). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 9, 18, 28, 34, and 39 depend from claims 1, 10, 19, 30, and 35, respectively, and inherit the limitations of the respective independent claim. As stated above, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “a configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” The discussion of ACARS and ATN in the present application does not cure the defect in Tidwell. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 9, 18, 28, 34 and 39 are not obvious over Tidwell in view of applicants' admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell (E.P. Application No. 0 981 088 A1) in view of Allison et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,900). The Applicant's respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 29 depends from claim 19 and, thus, inherits the limitations of claim 19. As discussed above, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “, wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” Nothing in Allison cures this defect in Tidwell. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claim 29 is not obvious over Tidwell in view of Allison. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 16, 26, 32, and 37 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell (E.P. Application No. 0 981 088 A1). The Applicant's respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 7, 16, 26, 32 and 37 depend from claims 1, 10, 19, 30, and 35, respectively, and inherit the limitations of the respective independent claim. As stated above, nothing in Tidwell teaches or suggests “a configuration information file (CIF), wherein the CIF is a table-driven data file.” Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, claims 9, 18, 28, 34 and 39 are not obvious over Tidwell. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/782,519

Filing Date: 2/18/2004

Attorney Docket No. 400.691US01

Title: SYSTEMS AND METHOD FOR ENCODING AND DECODING DATA MESSAGES

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-39 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 10, 2008

/David N. Fogg/

David N.Fogg
Reg. No. 35138

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731